

Id. “It is not necessary that [the plaintiff] pursue every method listed in ... [Pennsylvania] Rule 430(a) ... to satisfy the good faith effort requirement.” *Calabro*, 464 F. Supp. 2d at 472 & n.4. Second, “once [the defendant] is located, [the plaintiff] must show that she has made practical efforts to serve [the defendant] under the circumstances,” but has been unable to do so. *Id.* (citing *Clayman v. Jung*, 173 F.R.D. 138, 142 (E.D. Pa. 1997)) (emphasis in original). “[The] [p]laintiff bears the burden to show that these efforts were made.” *McFadden*, 2014 WL 5880097, at *4. Third, assuming the plaintiff “satisfied the first two steps, [the plaintiff’s] proposed alternate means of service must be reasonably calculated to provide [the defendant] with notice of the proceedings against him [or her].” *Calabro*, 464 F. Supp. 2d at 472.

Here, following review of Plaintiff’s motion and its exhibits regarding service, the same does not evidence, as outlined above, that Plaintiff has fully availed itself of sufficient efforts to locate the defendants. Further, the Complaint appears to request relief both *in rem* and *in personam* judgments. On the face of the Complaint, Plaintiff has not sufficiently alleged facts or a legal basis to support *in personam* jurisdiction over the Defendants, yet seeks service by publication in Armstrong County, Pennsylvania. Therefore, on these two bases, the Court cannot grant Plaintiff’s request at this time.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion to Serve by Publication (ECF No. 9) is denied, without prejudice. As regards Plaintiff’s *nunc pro tunc* motion for an extension of time to complete service, Plaintiff is granted a sixty (60) day extension to effectuate service.

DATED this 24th day of February, 2023.

BY THE COURT:



MARILYN J. HORAN
United States Magistrate Judge